

FEB 01 2000

MR. ROBERT HALSTEAD: Let me state for the record, my name is Robert J. Halstead. I'm transportation advisor for the state of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects. I am going to ask that my prepared comments be entered into the record as if they had been read in their entirety, so that I can comply with the time limit and make a few remarks.

1 Copies of my prepared statement, which include a detailed analysis of the shipments that would occur on each of the potential routes, highway and rail through Illinois, are in the back of the room and also being passed around. The State of Nevada opposes the Yucca Mountain project because we believe the site is technically unsuitable for a long-term geologic isolation of long-lived nuclear waste.

Because of the potential for adverse social and economic impacts and because the site was selected by the Congress as the only potential repository host site based on political science and not on earth science, we believe the draft environmental impact statement is substantively and legally deficient, and we expect that it will be challenged in federal court.

2 My focus today is on transportation issues, and particularly the Department's failure over most of the past six months to identify the cross-county rail and truck routes actually evaluated in the draft EIS.

The shipping routes used in that document make Illinois the third most heavily impacted corridor state after Nevada and Utah. But, of course, the draft EIS makes no specific reference to transportation impacts in Illinois.

Last Thursday the Department decided to reveal its state maps, the maps of the routes that were analyzed in Chapter 6 of the document on its Web site. I put the address in my comments. I think it is the map that Steve showed you. It's also an attachment in my statement, and I will note one improvement on the map that Steve showed you. If you go to the Web site, you might notice that Chicago is missing there because they only put state capitols on. But, of course, if Chicago was there, it would be hard to put it there because that is where all the blue lines for the rail routes converge.

2
cont'd. Now, the Department has not revealed that up to 75 percent of all the spent fuel and high-level waste shipped to Yucca Mountain will likely travel through Illinois. Under the mostly truck national scenario, about 73 percent of all shipments pass through Illinois. Under the mostly rail transportation scenario, 75 percent of the rail shipments and 87 percent of the truck shipments pass through Illinois.

3 The routes that are used for the out-of-state shipments, as you would expect, most of them enter on I-80, and from the south they come in on I-64 and I-57. The important number I think to remember is what is different from shipments in the past, and these shipments, both the shipment characteristics, length of shipments and so forth, are going to be radically different than in the past, but the most important difference is probably the number of shipments.

There certainly will be more waste moved every year than has been moved over the last 40 years

in the history of the nuclear history and on an average no matter which shipment scenario of the truck approaches DOE were to use, there would be four trucks a day every day through Illinois, and through Chicagoland you would expect about 11 truckloads per week.

- 4 [Rail shipments would also heavily impact Chicago. Those of you who know Chicago's history, know it is a big interchange point for railroads, even more so now that the Union Pacific has taken over the old Chicago Northwestern operation. And five major streams of rail shipments would come into Chicago, and then head west on the Union Pacific main line through Nebraska and Wyoming.

Other major streams on the CSXT and the Norfolk Southern would cross southern Illinois and a couple reactors use the Burlington Northern Santa Fe. Again, I have summarized these numbers in my statement. Over the 24-year period of the proposed action, Chicago would expect to see one shipment per day, every day for three or four decades when the truck and rail shipments are combined.

- 5 [Now, why is the State of Nevada concerned about transportation? We believe it is inherently risky business to move spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste, and we believe that the draft environmental impact statement significantly and systematically understates these risks.] Of course, I can't give you all the details today. I have put our Web site in the statement where you can see both our detailed comments and related comments.

- 10 Issue No. 1. [DOE has significantly overestimated the extent to which this waste can be moved by rail. They are optimistic and think they can move 90 percent of it by rail. We've looked at the same information site by site. We think they will only be able to move 50 to 60 percent by rail. The result is there will be many tens of thousands of truck shipments occurring at the same time that there are about ten thousand rail shipments.]

DR. LAWSON (Facilitator): 30 seconds, please.

- 6 MR. HALSTEAD: Issue No. 2. [We believe they have misrepresented the radiologic risk by using older, cooler, less radioactive fuel as their waste.]

- 6 (cont'd.) Issue No. 3. [We believe they've grossly underestimated routine radiation exposures, particularly at the end of the transportation funnel in Nevada.]

- 6 (cont'd.) No. 4. [We believe they've significantly underestimated both the human health consequences and the economic costs of severe accidents, which they acknowledge could release significant amounts of radioactive materials.]

- 7 No. 5. The same comment applies to [a successful terrorism or sabotage incident involving high energy explosive devices.]

- 8 Issue No. 6. [They completely ignore the social and economic impacts of the public's perception of risk, which could seriously affect property values and business activities along shipping

corridors.]

- 9 [And, finally, let me say, there's an overriding issue in transportation, and that is the Department's proposal to privatize, that is, contract out all the transportation services to one or more regional contracting authorities. And so anyone who has a question about how emergency response training will be conducted, about how routing and intergovernmental relations will occur, has to read between the lines of what the Department is promising and look at their request for proposals, where they propose to hire a low-cost bidder who presumably is going to try to make money on this business.]

- 11 Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments. This is the last hearing. I am going to take just a few seconds, Barry, just to say that [while you understand there is an extremely adversarial relationship between the State of Nevada and the Department of Energy over this project, there are many fine decent human beings who are very hard working and conscientious employees of the Department of Energy, as there are working for the State of Nevada. And I think it is important that we all see that this process is part of a process, a larger process created under the National Environmental Policy Act that is to try and guide our country in making better technical decisions, evaluating the impacts of large facilities, and that it also provides an important forum for citizens like yourselves, effective stakeholders who may work for the utilities and transportation companies.]

Thank you all for being here, and I would like to personally thank both the DOE people who have been carrying this meeting show around the country, and I would like to also thank the facilitators, who have had a very difficult job at times maintaining a fair and orderly process.